

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/521,852  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 23, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and further examination in view of the following remarks and arguments are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice. Further, the specification has been amended to correct certain informalities noted upon review.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-10 have been amended for better clarity, such as changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--, beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and deleting reference numerals typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Claims 1-10 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

The Examiner indicated that the title of the invention was not sufficiently descriptive, and required a new title. In response,

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/521,652  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

the current title has been deleted and substituted with a new title which is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because "the clarity the presence of a double filament configuration, as expressed in Fig. 3, 5 is poorly depicted." (Page 2, first 2 lines of second paragraph of the Office Action) It is respectfully submitted that this objection is not understood. At the outset, FIG 3 does NOT depict a lamp with a double filament. While FIG 5 does depict a lamp with a double filament, FIG 5 appears to be perfectly clear. Clarification is respectfully requested. At any rate, FIGS 3-4 have been amended to better show the filament in the region (33, 49) coated with filter material (34, 50). Replacement sheets including FIGS 3-4 are enclosed. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawings objection and approval of the enclosed proposed drawing changes.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0063503 (Tsuda). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S.

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/521,852  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

Patent No. 5,525,856 (Kawai). Further, claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,962,973 (Rice) in view of Tsuda. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tsuda in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,688,147 (Raago). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tsuda in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0209962 (Davies). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tsuda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,363 (Trigiani). There appears to be a typographical error on page 6, item 6 of the Office Action that incorrectly identifies Trigiani as U.S. Patent No. 6,710,636. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14 are patentable over Tsuda, Kawai, Rice, Raago, Davies and Trigiani for at least the following reasons.

Tsuda is directed to a discharge bulb having an IR transmitting film 40a provided on the bottom of a sealed glass bulb 22, shown in FIGs 1 and 2a. As shown in FIG 2b, the IR transmitting film 40a covers the lower 120° of the glass bulb 22. As recited on page 3, paragraph [0047], last two lines, the IR

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/521,852  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

transmitting film 40a prevents "colored light other than white light from exiting the sealed glass 22 downward." (Emphasis added)  
In particular, as recited on page 3, paragraph [0048], the IR transmitting film 40a "prevents the yellow-colored light from exiting the sealed glass bulb 22, only the white light exits the arc tube 20." (Emphasis added)

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

at least a first region which is at least partly permeable to infrared light and at least partly impermeable to white light.

Accordingly, the Tsuda IR transmitting film 40a that allows white light to exit the arc tube 20 teaches away from the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, which requires a first region which at least partly permeable to infrared light and also at least partly impermeable to white light.

Kawai is directed to a light irradiating device that has two reflectors. As shown in FIG 2, the first reflector 8 has a coating 30 that reflects visible light and passes UV light to the second reflector 9 that has a coating 31 which reflects the UV light.

PATENT

Serial No. 10/521,852

Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

Kawai is completely silent and does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 16 which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

a reflector configured to reflect said source light, said reflector having an upper sector for reflecting said source light downward to form a low beam, and a lower sector for reflecting said source light upward to form a high beam, said high beam having a higher direction than said low beam; and

a screen configured to receive said high beam from said lower sector and to substantially pass said UV light and said infrared light and block said visible light.

Rather Kawai merely teaches reflectors, without any teaching or suggestion of a screen that receives light from the reflector, as recited in independent claim 16.

Rice is directed to a dual filament bulb having high beam filament 21 and a low beam filament 23, as shown in FIG 2. A coating 79 is provided on the exterior surface of the bulb envelope. As recited on column 3, lines 56-60, the coating 79 reflects IR light and passes visible light.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, amongst other patentable elements, requires

PATENT

Serial No. 10/521,852

Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

(illustrative emphasis provided):

at least a first region which is at least  
partly permeable to infrared light and at least  
partly impermeable to white light.

The Rice coating 79 that reflects IR light and passes visible light is diametrically opposite the first region (recited in claim 1) which is partly permeable to infrared light and partly impermeable to white light. Thus, Rice also teaches away from the present invention as recited in independent claim 1.

Trigiani is directed to a lamp and method for detecting leaks in air-conditioning and refrigeration systems. Assuming, arguendo, that it is proper to combine Trigiani with Tsuda, it is respectfully pointed out that column 2, lines 37-39, recite a "dichroic filter with a dielectric coating allows UV, blue and IR wavelengths to be transmitted while most visible wavelengths are blocked." The mere teaching of such a coating cannot render the present invention obvious in view of Tsuda.

It is respectfully submitted that the only way to arrive at the present invention as recited in independent claim 16 is to use impermissible hindsight. There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Tsuda and Trigiani, alone or in combination, of the present

PATENT

Serial No. 10/521,852

Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

invention as recited in independent claim 16 which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

a reflector configured to reflect said source light, said reflector having an upper sector for reflecting said source light downward to form a low beam, and a lower sector for reflecting said source light upward to form a high beam, said high beam having a higher direction than said low beam; and

a screen configured to receive said high beam from said lower sector and to substantially pass said UV light and said infrared light and block said visible light.

There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Tsuda, Trigiani, and combination thereof, to have a screen as recited in independent claim 16. Where exactly is the suggestion or motivation in Tsuda or Trigiani to include the Trigiani coating in the lamp of Tsuda in such a way as to arrive at the present invention as recited in independent claim 16? It is respectfully submitted that a screen configured to receive high beam from the lower reflector sector and to substantially pass UV and IR lights, and block visible light, as recited in independent claim 16, is nowhere taught or suggested in Tsuda, Trigiani, and combination thereof.

Davies is directed to an incandescent lamp where the entire outer glass is coated with an IR reflective coating, as recited in

PATENT

Serial No. 10/521,852

Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

paragraph [0007]. It is not clear how the combination of Davies and Tsuda would teach or suggest the present invention as recited in dependent claim 8. At best, the combination of Davies and Tsuda would result in the lamp of Tsuda being covered entirely by the Davies IR reflective coating, as opposed to being confined to a region as recited dependent claim 8.

Raago is cited in rejecting dependent claim 7 to allegedly show means for safeguarding a neutral color impression within a white region and does not remedy the deficiencies in Tsuda, Kawai, Rice, Davies and Trigiani.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 16 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10 and 13-15 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claim 1.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to



PATENT

Serial No. 10/521,852

Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required for entrance of the accompanying amendment, they may be charged to Applicants' representatives Deposit Account No. 50-3649. In addition, please credit any overpayments related to any fees paid in connection with the accompanying amendment to Deposit Account No. 50-3649.

PATENT

Serial No. 10/521,852

Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By *Dan Halajian*  
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
June 23, 2006

Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheet (1 sheet including FIGs 3-4)  
New Abstract

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/521,852  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

IN THE TITLE

Please delete the current title in its entirety and substitute  
therefore the following new title:

LAMP EMITTING VISIBLE AND IR LIGHT

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/521,852  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

IN THE ABSTRACT

Please delete the current Abstract in its entirety and  
substitute therefor the enclosed New Abstract.

PATENT  
Serial No. 10/521,852  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006

IN THE DRAWING

Please replace FIGs 3-4 with the enclosed replacement FIGs 3-4.